

Attachment to Interview Summary

Nickerson, Jeffrey L.

From: Loos, Thomas [loos@mbhb.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 9:41 PM
To: Nickerson, Jeffrey L.
Cc: Machorkin, Rick; Laske, Jessica
Subject: USPA 10/840,083 -- Agenda for Examiner Interview on 14 Jun 2011 (Docket No. 08-968)
Examiner Nickerson,

Thank you for agreeing to have an interview for U.S. Pat. App. No. 10/840,083 on Tuesday June 14, 2011 at 2 PM Eastern. I plan to call you at your desk number, 571 270 3631, for our interview.

After we agreed upon our time, I realized that I had previously signed up for a class that may conflict with our interview. So, if we could push back our interview to 3 PM Eastern (or later in the afternoon), I would appreciate it. However, if rescheduling is not feasible, I will be prepared to have our interview at 2 PM.

I would like to discuss the 112 and 103 rejections you set forth in the most recent non-final office action.

1. Regarding the 112 rejections, we are prepared to argue that claims 66-75 are definite as indicated by at least paragraphs 0019-0021, 0026, 0028-0032, 0038-0040, and 0043-0050 of the Specification, as well as at least Figures 1, 5, and 6.
2. Regarding the 103 rejections, we propose the following amendments to claim 1:

1. (Currently Amended) A system, comprising:

a first session initiation protocol (SIP) proxy, configured to:

support routing of communications for a first plurality of clients in a first region, wherein the communications comprise push-to-talk communications, and to store a value of a local domain for the first region;

wherein a first client of the first plurality of clients is configured to register with a the second SIP proxy and optionally with the first SIP proxy;

wherein the first SIP proxy is further configured to determine whether the a first client of the first plurality of clients is registered with the first SIP proxy, wherein the first client is configured to optionally register with the first SIP proxy, and wherein the first client is associated with a predetermined home domain; [[.]] and[[.]]

in response to determining that the first client is registered with the first SIP proxy:

determine whether or not a push-to-talk communication originated by the first client home domain is the local domain for [[to]] the first region; based at least in part on the stored value of the local domain;

set up a push-to-talk communication in the first region responsive to determining that the push-to-talk communication home domain is the local domain;[[.]] and

set up the push-to-talk communication in [[the]] a second region responsive to determining that the push-to-talk communication home domain is not the local domain.

We are prepared to argue amended claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Crockett and Chambert, alone or in combination. We also propose to make similar amendments to independent claims 29, 66, and 76.

While we may discuss other claims and the remaining cited art, I believe we can concentrate on

proposed amended claim 1 and Crockett and Chambert.

I look forward to our conversation on Tuesday.

Sincerely,

Tom

Tom Loos

MBHB

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel. (312) 913-3338
Fax (312) 913-0002